

U.S.S.N. 10/063,092

8

201-0486 (FGT 1540 PA)

REMARKS

In the Advisory Action dated August 12, 2004, claims 1-3 and 5-23 are pending. Claims 1, 13, 17, and 20 are independent claims from which all other claims depend therefrom. Claims 1, 13, 17, and 20 have been amended.

Claims 1-3, 5-7, 10-12, and 17-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Turnbull et al. (6,166,698). Applicants, respectfully, submit that Turnbull fails to teach or suggest each and every element of independent claims 1, 17, and 20.

The Advisory Action refers to the black box of Turnbull, column 25 for the teaching of an object detection system and object detection signal. The Advisory Action states that Turnbull discloses synchronizing a time of a collision event in real time after using inertial detectors to detect an object that impacts a user's car.

In response to the Advisory Action the Applicants have amended claims 1, 17, and 20 such that "a non-inertial based object detection signal" is generated rather than an "object detection signal" and such that the non-inertial based object detection signal is synchronized with a real time signal. Turnbull clearly fails to teach or suggest the generation of a non-inertial based object detection signal and the synchronization thereof with a real time signal.

In addition, claim 17 has been further amended to include the limitations of: A) generating a non-inertial based object detection signal after detection of and in response to an object in proximity with the vehicle via an object detection system; B) performing vehicle tasks after detection of the object; and C) storing the non-inertial based object detection signal and performance times of the vehicle tasks in synchronization with a real time signal. Applicants further submit that Turnbull fails to teach or suggest any of the stated limitations A-C. Note that in col. 25, lines 8-11, that Turnbull discloses a data recorder that stops recording upon detection that the airbags have deployed or upon detection of impact. Thus, Turnbull fails to disclose or suggest above stated limitations,

U.S.S.N. 10/063,092

9

201-0486 (FGT 1540 PA)

which are performed after the detection of an object rather than upon the detection of an object.

Thus, since Turnbull fails to teach or suggest each and every limitation of claims 1, 17, and 20, claims 1, 17, and 20 are novel, nonobvious, and are in a condition for allowance. Also, since claims 2-3, 5-7, 10-12, 18-19, and 21-23 depend from claims 1, 17, and 20, respectfully, they are also novel, nonobvious, and are in a condition for allowance for at least the same reasons.

Claims 13 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Turnbull in view of Camhi (USPN 5,430,432). Applicants, respectfully, submit that neither Camhi nor Turnbull teach or suggest each and every limitation as recited in claim 13. Claim 13 has been amended to also include the limitation of generating a non-inertial based object detection signal and the synchronization thereof with a real time signal.

Camhi is directed to an automotive warning and recording system. As with Turnbull, Camhi also fails to teach or suggest the generation of a non-inertial based object detection signal and the synchronization thereof with a real time signal. Camhi fails to teach or suggest the synchronization of any signal with a real time signal.

Thus, since neither Turnbull nor Camhi alone or in combination teach or suggest the generation and synchronization of real time signals and non-inertial based object detection signals, Turnbull and Camhi fail to teach or suggest the addition limitations of the communication of the stated signals to a collision evaluation center, and the reconstruction of a collision event in response to the stated signals.

Applicants now refer to MPEP 706.02(j) and submit that to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness the prior art references must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Since Turnbull and Camhi fail to teach or suggest each and every limitation of claim 13, claim 13 is also novel, nonobvious, and is in a

U.S.S.N. 10/063,092

10


201-0486 (FGT 1540 PA)

condition for allowance. Since claims 14-16 depend from claim 13, they are also novel, nonobvious, and are in a condition for allowance for at least the same reasons.

In light of the remarks, the Applicants submit that all objections and rejections are now overcome. The Applicants respectfully submit that the application is now in condition for allowance and expeditious notice thereof is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner have any questions or comments, he is respectfully requested to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

ARTZ & ARTZ P.C.


Jeffrey J. Chapp, Reg. No. 50,579
28333 Telegraph Road, Suite 250
Southfield, MI 48034
(248) 223-9500

Dated: October 19, 2004